

REMARKS

This Response to Restriction Requirement supplements the previously submitted Response to Restriction Requirement dated September 12, 2008 which the Examiner deemed to be not fully responsive. It is assumed by the Applicants that the claim amendments set forth in the Response to Restriction Requirement dated September 12, 2008 have been entered since the Examiner has not indicated otherwise.

Claims 1-15 and 17-19 are pending and remain for consideration.

Applicants hereby elect with traverse to pursue in this application the species of Figs. 10 and 11 as categorized by the Examiner and directed to independent claim 2. Moreover, Applicants also hereby elect with traverse to pursue the sub-species covering claim 5.

The elected sub-species covering claim 5 depends from and thereby incorporates the limitations of claims 3 and 4 in its chain of dependency from the elected species covering claim 2. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 4 should also be included with the election of the species covering claim 2. Applicants also note that in the original PCT application from which the present application claims priority, claim 3 did originally depend from claim 2.

The requirement for electing a species and sub-species is being traversed because it is our opinion that claims 1 and 2 are the same species (and thus Figs. 10, 11 and 12 are the same species). Figs. 10 and 11 illustrates a processing device including a plurality of units which are functionally separate from one another. Each of the units has an upper work tool and a lower work tool. Likewise, Fig. 12 illustrates a processing device including a plurality of units which are functionally separate from each other. Each of the units also has an upper work

tool and a lower work tool. The mere difference between the device of Figs. 10 and 11 and the device of Fig. 12 is that the units of Figs. 10 and 11 are structurally separate units, whereas the units of Fig. 12 have groups of working tools and partly share the same structure even though the units are functionally separate. Merely separating or combining structure supporting the upper and lower work tools should not rise to a degree of distinction requiring different species classification. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to allow for examination in the present application claims reading on the device shown in Fig. 12 including claim 1 and the claims which ultimately dependent from claim 1 (i.e., claims 10-12).

Claim 18 was previously added to include the limitations of elected claim 2 and claims 13 and 17. Claim 19 was previously added to include the limitations of claim 1 (which Applicants argue above is directed to the same species of elected claim 2) and claims 3 and 13.

No fees or deficiencies in fees are believed to be owed. However, authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 13-0235 in the event any such fees are owed.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Daniel G. Mackas/
Daniel G. Mackas
Registration No. 38,541
Attorney for Applicants

Customer No. 35301
McCORMICK, PAULDING & HUBER LLP
CityPlace II, 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3410
(860) 549-5290